

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed June 15, 2006, wherein claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-32 were pending in the application, with claims 15-19 having been earlier withdrawn. Claims 15-19 and 22 are herein cancelled, without prejudice. New claims 33-41 are added herein. Therefore, presently pending are claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-14, 20-21 and 23-41. Having added 9 new total claims and 1 new independent claim, applicants submit along with this Amendment additional filing fees for 1 independent claim over 3 and 9 more total claims over 20.

In the June 15, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 10-14 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner found the language of claim 1, lines 3-4, "wherein said first ... reflective surfaces" to be vague, indefinite and/or confusing. While applicants do not at all believe this language to be confusing, vague or indefinite, and instead believe it precisely recites the invention, applicants have nevertheless amended claim 1 to more particularly recite that each of the first and second mounting surfaces are substantially perpendicular to each of the first and second reflective surfaces. If the Examiner still believes this language is indefinite, he is urged to call the undersigned to resolve it over the telephone.

In the June 15, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 10 and 11 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Taggart ('501). Applicants respectfully traverse these grounds for rejection through the same amendment to claim 1 discussed above to overcome the 112 rejection.

Finally, in the June 15, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 10, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 28 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Masutani ('363). Applicants respectfully traverse these grounds for rejection of claim 1 and its dependents through the same amendment to claim 1 discussed above to overcome the 112 rejection and for rejection of claim 21 and its dependents by incorporating the limitation of objected to claim 22 into independent claim 21.

New claims 33-41 add no new matter into the application and instead, independent claim 33 is simply a combination of independent claim 21 and its dependent, objected to claim 30.

As all of the now pending independent claims (1, 21 and 33) are allowable, all of their respective dependent claims, if any, are also allowable.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication of allowable subject matter in the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance in view of the above remarks and amendments.

A Fee Transmittal sheet (PTO/SB/17(01-06)) is submitted herewith for the fee for a small entity for nine (9) additional claims over 20 (\$225) and for one (1) independent claim over 3 (\$100) and this payment is being made on the EFS system by charging applicant's attorney's credit card in the total amount of \$325. In the event there are any additional fees due and owing in connection with this matter, or which should be credited back to applicant, please charge/apply the same to our Deposit Account No. 11-0223.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: August 29, 2006

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Michael R. Gilman  
Registration No. 34,826  
Kaplan Gilman Gibson & Dernier LLP  
900 Route 9 North, Suite 504  
Woodbridge, NJ 07095  
(732) 634-7634  
Attorneys for Applicants and Assignee